arXiv:hep-ph/0202191v1 20 Feb 2002

DPNU-02-04

Fermion Mass Hierarchy in 6 dimensional SO(10) SUSY GUT

N. Haba[1,2], T. Kondo[2] and Y. Shimizu[2]

[1]*Faculty of Engineering, Mie University, Tsu, Mie, 514-8507, Japan*

[2]*Department of Physics, Nagoya University, Nagoya, 464-8602, Japan*

Abstract

We suggest simple models which produce the suitable fermion mass hierarchies and flavor mixing angles based on the supersymmetric $SO(10)$ grand unified theory in 6 dimensions compactified on a T^2/Z_2 orbifold. The gauge and Higgs fields propagate in 6 dimensions while ordinal chiral matter fields are localized in 4 dimensions. We introduce extra vector-like heavy fields in the extra dimensions. We show three models according to the configurations of vector-like fields in extra dimensions. The suitable fermion mass hierarchies and flavor mixings are generated by integrating out these vector-like heavy fields.

1 Introduction

Grand unified theories (GUTs) are very attractive models in which the three gauge groups are unified at a high energy scale. However, one of the most serious problems to construct a model of GUTs is how to realize the mass splitting between the triplet and the doublet Higgs particles in the Higgs sector. This problem is so-called triplet-doublet (TD) splitting problem. Recently, a new idea for solving the TD splitting problem has been suggested in 5 dimensional (5D) $SU(5)$ GUT where the 5th dimensional coordinate is compactified on an $S^1/(Z_2 \times Z_2')$ orbifold [1]-[4], where only Higgs and gauge fields can propagate in 5 dimensions. The orbifolding makes the $SU(5)$ gauge group reduce to the SM gauge group and realizes the TD splitting since the doublet (triplet) Higgs fields have (not) Kaluza-Klein zero-modes. Following this new idea, a lot of works are made progress in the directions of larger unified gauge symmetry and higher space-time dimensions[5]-[11]. In these models, gauge symmetry and supersymmetry are broken through orbifold projections and/or the Scherk-Schwarz mechanism[12]. Especially, the reduction of $SO(10)$ gauge symmetry and the TD splitting solution are discussed in 6D models in Refs.[6][7].

Several trials of producing fermion mass hierarchies in the extra dimensional scenario have been done in Refs.[3][8][9]. Especially, the model in Ref.[8] can induce the natural fermion mass hierarchies and flavor mixings, based on an $N = 1$ SUSY ((1,0)-SUSY) $SO(10)$ GUT in 6 dimensions where the 5th and 6th dimensional coordinates are compactified on a T^2/Z_2 orbifold[7]. The gauge and Higgs fields live in 6 dimensions while ordinal chiral matter fields are localized in 4 dimensions[*]. The orbifolding and boundary conditions make the $SO(10)$ gauge group be broken to $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times U(1)_X$ and realize the TD splitting. In addition to the three-generation chiral matter fields, extra three sets of vector-like matter fields have been introduced: two sets of $\mathbf{16}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{16}}$, and four $\mathbf{10}$ representation fields[†] propagate in 6 dimensions, and chiral fields which couple to $\mathbf{16}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{16}}$ are defined as the 1st generation, and one set of $\mathbf{16}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{16}}$ propagates in 5 dimensions and chiral fields which couple to them are defined as the 2nd generation. The mixing angles between the chiral fields and extra generations have been determined by the volume suppression factors. In this paper, we suggest two more models as extensions of the model in Ref.[8] by introducing additional vector-like matter multiplets propagate in the bulk. These models have different configurations of additional vector-like fields in extra dimension. The suitable fermion mass hierarchies and flavor mixings are generated by integrating out these vector-like heavy fields.

---

[*] $N = 1$ SUSY ((1,0)-SUSY) in 6 dimensions requires the gauginos to have opposite chirality from the matter fermions which must all share the same chirality [2][13]. This feature strongly constrains our model when discussing 6D gauge anomaly.

[†] These $\mathbf{10}$ representation matter fields should have the same 6D chirality as $\mathbf{10}$ representation Higgs fields for the 6D irreducible gauge anomaly cancellation[2].

2 Framework in 6D SO(10) SUSY GUT

We discussed the fermion mass hierarchy in the 6D $N = 1$ SUSY ((1,0)-SUSY) $SO(10)$ GUT [8]. The extra dimensions are compactified on a T^2/Z_2 orbifold, whose coordinates (x_5, x_6) can be represented by the complex plane, $z \equiv x_5 + ix_6$. The structure of extra 2D spaces are characterized by reflection P and translations T_i $(i = 1, 2)$. Under the reflection P, z is transformed into $-z$, which corresponds to the π rotation on the complex plane. Under the translation T_i, z is transformed into $z + 2\pi R_5$ and $z + i2\pi R_6$, respectively. R_5 and R_6 are the two radii of T^2. We adopted the translations as $(T_1, T_2) = (T_{51}, T_{5'1'})$ where $T_{51} = \sigma_2 \otimes I_5$ and $T_{5'1'} = \sigma_2 \otimes diag.(1, 1, 1, -1, -1)$, which commute the generators of the Georgi-Glashow $SU(5) \times U(1)_X$[14] and the flipped $SU(5)' \times U(1)'_X$[15] groups, respectively as in Refs.[6][7].

When we construct a model on the 6D $N = 1$ SUSY $SO(10)$ GUT, we must pay attentions to following two characteristic features. At first, 6D $N = 1$ SUSY ((1,0)-SUSY) algebra determines the relation of 6D chiralities between the gauge, Higgs and matter multiplets, automatically. 6D $N = 1$ SUSY ((1,0)-SUSY) algebra requires the gauginos to have opposite chirality from the matter fermions which must all share the same chirality[2][13]. Thus, the 6D chiralities of all matter and Higgs fields which we introduced are the same each other, and opposite to those of gauginos. Second, since the 6D theory is the chiral theory, the 6D anomalies must be canceled by only the field propagating in 6 dimensions. We know the 6D irreducible gauge anomaly do cancel between a gauge multiplet and two **10** hypermultiplet or between a **16** (or $\overline{\mathbf{16}}$) and a **10** hypermultiplet [‡].

We consider the set-up that the gauge multiplet and two **10** representation Higgs multiplets propagate in the 6D bulk and the ordinal three-generation matter multiplets ($\mathbf{16}_i$, $i = 1, 2, 3$) localized on the 4D brane ($z = 0$). These field contents are free from gauge anomaly in 6 dimensions[2] . Moreover, the reflection(P) and translations(T_i) make the $SO(10)$ gauge group be broken to $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times U(1)_X$ and realize the TD splitting since the doublet (triplet) Higgs fields have (not) Kaluza-Klein zero-modes.

For the matter fields, we introduced additional hypermultiplets, $\psi_{\mathbf{16}}$ ($\psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}}$), in the bulk. When the hypermultiplet $\psi_{\mathbf{16}}$ propagates in the 6D bulk, we can classify $\psi_{\mathbf{16}}$s into four types below,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\psi_{\mathbf{16}++} &&\text{(zero mode)} \ = Q, \\
&\psi_{\mathbf{16}+-} &&\text{(zero modes)} = \overline{U}, \overline{E}, \\
&\psi_{\mathbf{16}-+} &&\text{(zero modes)} = \overline{D}, \overline{N}, \\
&\psi_{\mathbf{16}--} &&\text{(zero mode)} \ = L,
\end{aligned} \qquad (1)$$

where the first $\pm$ sign represents the T_1 parity, while the second $\pm$ sign represents the T_2 parity. Equation (1) shows zero-mode fields in each type of **16** representation

---

[‡] Other reducible anomalies can be canceled by the Green-Schwarz mechanism [16].

matter multiplet	additional multiplets
$\mathbf{16}_1$	$\psi_{\mathbf{16}++}$, $\psi_{\mathbf{16}+-}$
$\mathbf{16}_2$	$\psi_{\mathbf{16}+}$
$\mathbf{16}_3$	

Table 1: The matter fields in the previous model

field. For the cancellation of the irreducible 6D gauge anomaly, we must introduce **10** representation hypermultiplets as many as the additional hypermultiplets, $\psi_{\mathbf{16}}$ ($\psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}}$). Similarly, when the hypermultiplet $\psi_{\mathbf{16}}$ propagates in the 5D bulk ($x_6 = 0$), we can classify $\psi_{\mathbf{16}}$s into the two types below,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\mathbf{16}+} \qquad & \text{(zero mode)} = Q, \overline{U}, \overline{E}, \\ \psi_{\mathbf{16}-} \qquad & \text{(zero mode)} = L, \overline{D}, \overline{N}, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where the ± sign represents the T_1 parity.

2.1 Previous model

Here let us review the previous model in Ref.[8] briefly. In the model we introduced $\psi_{\mathbf{16}++} + \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}++} \equiv \psi_{\mathbf{16}_4} + \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_4}$ and $\psi_{\mathbf{16}+-} + \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}+-} \equiv \psi'_{\mathbf{16}_4} + \psi'_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_4}$ (we call them the 4th generation fields) which propagate in the 6D bulk and interact with only the 1st generation matter multiplets. For the 6D gauge anomaly cancellation, four **10** representation matter fields should also be introduced in 6D bulk, which are heavy enough to have nothing to do with the fermion mass hierarchies. In 5D bulk ($x_6 = 0$), we introduced $\psi_{\mathbf{16}+} + \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}+} \equiv \psi_{\mathbf{16}_5} + \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_5}$, (we call them the 5th generation fields) which interact with only the 2nd generation matter multiplets.

We put Higgs fields, $H_{\mathbf{16}}$ and $H_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}}$, on 4D brane ($z = 0$), which are assumed to take vacuum expectation values (VEVs) of $O(10^{16})$ GeV in the directions of $B - L$. We impose Peccei-Quinn symmetry and its charge on the multiplets: all matter multiplets have its charge 1, **10** representation Higgs multiplets have its charge -2, and **16** and $\overline{\mathbf{16}}$ representation Higgs multiplets have its charge -1. The following interactions between the chiral and extra generation fields on 4D brane, $z = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} W_6 \;=\; & H_{16} H_{\overline{16}} \left\{ \frac{y_{44}}{M_*^3} \psi_{\mathbf{16}_4} \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_4} + \frac{y'_{44}}{M_*^3} \psi'_{\mathbf{16}_4} \psi'_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_4} + \frac{y_{14}}{M_*^2} \mathbf{16}_1 \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_4} + \frac{y'_{14}}{M_*^2} \mathbf{16}_1 \psi'_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_4} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{y_{55}}{M_*^2} \psi_{\mathbf{16}_5} \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_5} + \frac{y_{25}}{M_*^{3/2}} \mathbf{16}_2 \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_5} \right\} \delta(x_5) \delta(x_6), \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

induce the mass terms for the Kaluza-Klein zero-modes of vector-like matter fields[§]

[§] As for **10** representation matter fields in 6D, they have nothing to do with the fermion mass as,

$$\begin{aligned} W_4 \;\simeq\; & \frac{v_N^2}{M_*}\left\{\epsilon_1^4\left(Q_4^{(0)}\overline{Q}_4^{(0)} + U_4'^{(0)}\overline{U}_4'^{(0)} + E_4'^{(0)}\overline{E}_4'^{(0)}\right) + \epsilon_1^2\left(Q_1\overline{Q}_4^{(0)} + \overline{U}_1 U_4'^{(0)} + \overline{E}_1 E_4'^{(0)}\right)\right. \\ & \left. +\epsilon_2^2\left(Q_5^{(0)}\overline{Q}_5^{(0)} + U_5^{(0)}\overline{U}_5^{(0)} + E_5^{(0)}\overline{E}_5^{(0)}\right) + \epsilon_2\left(Q_2\overline{Q}_5^{(0)} + \overline{U}_2 U_5^{(0)} + \overline{E}_2 E_5^{(0)}\right)\right\}, \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

where $\langle H_{\mathbf{16}}\rangle = \langle H_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}}\rangle \equiv v_N$ and ϵ_is are the volume suppression factors,

$$\epsilon_1 \equiv \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\pi(R_5R_6)^{1/2}M_*}}, \quad \epsilon_2 \equiv \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\pi R_5 M_*}}. \quad (5)$$

Here we assume all Yukawa couplings are of order one. Thus the volume suppression factors $\epsilon_{1,2}$ play crucial roles for generating the fermion mass matrices in the low energy. After integrating out the heavy fields, the model gives the following mass matrices in the up quark sector, the down quark sector, and the charged lepton sector[8],

$$m_u^l \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1^4 & \epsilon_2\epsilon_1^2 & \epsilon_1^2 \\ \epsilon_1^2\epsilon_2 & \epsilon_2^2 & \epsilon_2 \\ \epsilon_1^2 & \epsilon_2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} v, \;\; m_d^l \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1^2 & \epsilon_1^2 & \epsilon_1^2 \\ \epsilon_2 & \epsilon_2 & \epsilon_2 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \overline{v}, \;\; m_e^l \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1^2 & \epsilon_2 & 1 \\ \epsilon_1^2 & \epsilon_2 & 1 \\ \epsilon_1^2 & \epsilon_2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \overline{v}, \quad (6)$$

respectively. $\overline{v}$ and v are the vacuum expectation values of the weak Higgs doublets in **10** representation Higgs multiplets. We write the mass matrices in the basis that the left-handed fermions are to the left and the right-handed fermions are to the right. We notice that all elements in the mass matrices have $O(1)$ coefficients. When we set $1/R_5 = 1/R_6 = O(10^{16})$ GeV, Eq.(5) gives $\epsilon_i \sim 0.04$. Thus, we can regard $\epsilon_i \simeq \lambda^2$, where λ is the Cabibbo angle, $\lambda \sim 0.2$. This model induces the fermion mass hierarchies as,

$$\begin{aligned} m_t : m_c : m_u &\simeq 1 : \lambda^4 : \lambda^8 , && (7) \\ m_b : m_s : m_d &\simeq m_\tau : m_\mu : m_e \simeq 1 : \lambda^2 : \lambda^4 , && (8) \end{aligned}$$

with the large $\tan\beta$. The mass matrix of three light neutrinos $m_\nu^{(l)}$ through the see-saw mechanism[17] as

$$m_\nu^{(l)} \simeq \frac{m_\nu^D m_\nu^{DT}}{M_R} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \frac{v^2}{M_R}. \quad (9)$$

M_R is about 10^{14} GeV induced from the interaction on $z = 0$,

$$W_{M_N} = \frac{y_{ij}^N}{M_*} H_{\overline{16}} H_{\overline{16}} \mathbf{16}_i \mathbf{16}_j \delta(x_5)\delta(x_6), \quad (10)$$

---

hierarchies due to the PQ-symmetry and the mass terms are generated through the interactions on $z = 0$, $W_{\psi_{\mathbf{10}}} \sim \frac{1}{M_*^3} H_{\mathbf{16}} H_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}} \psi_{\mathbf{10}} \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{10}}} \delta(x_5)\delta(x_6)$.

matter multiplet	additional multiplets
$\mathbf{16}_1$	$\psi_{\mathbf{16}_{++}}$, $\psi_{\mathbf{16}_{+-}}$, $\psi_{\mathbf{16}_{-}}$
$\mathbf{16}_2$	$\psi_{\mathbf{16}_{+}}$
$\mathbf{16}_3$	

Table 2: The matter fields in the Model I

where $i, j = 1 \sim 3$ are the generation indices. We can obtain the suitable mass scale ($O(10^{-1})$ eV), for the atmospheric neutrino oscillation experiments, taking account for the $SO(10)$ relation of $y_u \simeq y_\nu$.

As for the flavor mixings, the CKM[18] and the MNS[19] matrices are given by

$$V_{CKM} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^4 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad V_{MNS} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{11}$$

They give us a natural explanation why the flavor mixing in the quark sector is small while the flavor mixing in the lepton sector is large[20]-[22]. They suggest the suitable flavor mixings roughly in order of magnitudes. However, they show too small Cabibbo angle and too large U_{e3}. In order to obtain the suitable values of them, we need suitable choice of $O(1)$ coefficients in mass matrices. A suitable choice of $O(1)$ coefficients in the mass matrix can really derive the suitable flavor mixings consistent with the neutrino oscillation experiments as shown in Ref.[20]. On the other hand, if $O(1)$ coefficients are not determined by a specific reason (symmetry)[¶], it is meaningful to see the most probable hierarchy and mixing angles by considering random $O(1)$ coefficients[22]. However, if the neutrino mixing angles are very closed to be maximal or zero, it is natural that the mass matrices must be modified to fit the experimental data in *order* (power of λ) not by tunings of $O(1)$ coefficients. We will discuss this trial in the following two sections.

3 Model I

For the extension of the model[8], we consider the situation where the additional vector-like matter multiplets propagate in the bulk. In model I, we introduced the matter multiplets, $\psi_{\mathbf{16}_-} + \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_-} \equiv \psi''_{\mathbf{16}_4} + \psi''_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_4}$ (we call them the 4th generation fields) which propagate in the 5D bulk ($x_6 = 0$) and interact with only the 1st generation matter multiplet in addition to the previous model[8]. They have PQ charge 1 as the other matter fields have.

[¶] This situation means the case when flavor mixing angles are not very closed to maximals or zeros but just large or small non-specific $O(1)$ values.

In this case the following terms are added to Eq.(3)

$$W_6 \;=\; H_{16}H_{\overline{16}}\left\{\frac{y''_{44}}{M_*^2}\psi''_{\mathbf{16}_4}\psi''_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_4}+\frac{y''_{24}}{M_*^{3/2}}\mathbf{16}_2\psi''_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_4}\right\}\delta(x_5)\delta(x_6), \tag{12}$$

then the term

$$\begin{aligned} W_4 \;\simeq\; & \frac{v_N^2}{M_*}\left\{\epsilon_2^2\left(L_4''^{(0)}\overline{L}_4''^{(0)}+D_4''^{(0)}\overline{D}_4''^{(0)}+N_4''^{(0)}\overline{N}_4''^{(0)}\right)\right. \\ & \left.+\epsilon_2\left(L_2\overline{L}_4''^{(0)}+\overline{D_2}D_4''^{(0)}+\overline{N_2}N_4''^{(0)}\right)\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

is added to Eq.(4). After integrating out the heavy vector-like fields, the mass matrices of the light eigenstates in the up quark sector, the down quark sector, and the charged lepton sector become

$$m_u^l \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1^4 & \epsilon_2\epsilon_1^2 & \epsilon_1^2 \\ \epsilon_1^2\epsilon_2 & \epsilon_2^2 & \epsilon_2 \\ \epsilon_1^2 & \epsilon_2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} v,\;\; m_d^l \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1^2\epsilon_2 & \epsilon_1^2 & \epsilon_1^2 \\ \epsilon_2^2 & \epsilon_2 & \epsilon_2 \\ \epsilon_2 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \overline{v},\;\; m_e^l \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1^2\epsilon_2 & \epsilon_2^2 & \epsilon_2 \\ \epsilon_1^2 & \epsilon_2 & 1 \\ \epsilon_1^2 & \epsilon_2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \overline{v}, \tag{14}$$

respectively. The mass matrices of the light eigenstates in the left-handed neutrino sector and the right-handed neutrino sector are given as

$$m_\nu^D \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_2^2 & \epsilon_2 & \epsilon_2 \\ \epsilon_2 & 1 & 1 \\ \epsilon_2 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} v,\;\; m_N \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_2^2 & \epsilon_2 & \epsilon_2 \\ \epsilon_2 & 1 & 1 \\ \epsilon_2 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} M_R. \tag{15}$$

Then the mass matrix of three light neutrinos $m_\nu^{(l)}$ through the see-saw mechanism is given by

$$m_\nu^{(l)} \simeq \frac{m_\nu^D m_\nu^{DT}}{m_N} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_2^2 & \epsilon_2 & \epsilon_2 \\ \epsilon_2 & 1 & 1 \\ \epsilon_2 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \frac{v^2}{M_R}. \tag{16}$$

When we set $\epsilon_1 \sim \epsilon_2 \sim \lambda^2$, which means $1/R_5 = 1/R_6 = O(10^{16})$ GeV, we obtain the following fermion mass matrices[23]

$$\begin{aligned} m_u^l &\simeq \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^8 & \lambda^6 & \lambda^4 \\ \lambda^6 & \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} v,\;\; m_d^l \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^6 & \lambda^4 & \lambda^4 \\ \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \overline{v}, \\ m_e^l &\simeq \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^6 & \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 & 1 \\ \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \overline{v},\;\; m_\nu^{(l)} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \frac{v^2}{M_R}. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

They induce the more suitable fermion mass hierarchies in the power of λ for the down quark and the charged lepton sectors,

$$\begin{aligned} m_t : m_c : m_u &\simeq 1 : \lambda^4 : \lambda^8 \;, \\ m_b : m_s : m_d &\simeq m_\tau : m_\mu : m_e \simeq 1 : \lambda^2 : \lambda^6 \;, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

with large $\tan\beta$. In order to obtain the realistic neutrino mass hierarchy pattern which is consistent with neutrino oscillation experiments, the rank of 2×2 sub-matrix in the 2nd and the 3rd generations in $m_\nu^{(l)}$ should be reduced, and the light eigenvalue of this sub-matrix should be smaller than $O(\lambda^2)$. Then we might obtain the hierarchical type of neutrino mass, $m_1 \ll m_2 \ll m_3$[24].

As for the flavor mixings, the CKM and the MNS matrices are given by

$$V_{CKM} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^4 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad V_{MNS} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1/\sqrt{2} & 1/\sqrt{2} & \lambda^2 \\ 1/2 & -1/2 & 1/\sqrt{2} \\ -1/2 & 1/2 & 1/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{19}$$

where we assume the reduction of rank discussed above in the neutrino mass matrix, $m_\nu^{(l)}$, for obtaining this MNS matrix. This type of flavor mixing matrix is so-called bi-maximal one. Without the rank reduction, the mixing between the 1st and the 2nd generations can not be maximal. Since the value of U_{e3} is of order λ^2 in model I, we do not need to choose $O(1)$ coefficients as we did in the previous model. The CKM matrix has the same structure as in the previous model. This case shows the relation between the Cabibbo angle and quark masses, $\lambda^2 \sim \sqrt{m_d/m_s}$. Needless to say, the suitable choice of O(1) coefficients can reproduce the masses and the mixings of quarks and leptons as in the previous model.

For another choice, when we set $\epsilon_1 \sim \lambda^{3/2}$ and $\epsilon_2 \sim \lambda^2$, which means $1/R_5 = O(10^{16})$ GeV and $1/R_6 = O(10^{17})$ GeV, we obtain the following fermion mass matrices[25],

$$\begin{aligned} m_u^l &\simeq \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^6 & \lambda^5 & \lambda^3 \\ \lambda^5 & \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^3 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} v, \quad m_d^l \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^5 & \lambda^3 & \lambda^3 \\ \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \overline{v}, \\ m_e^l &\simeq \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^5 & \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^3 & \lambda^2 & 1 \\ \lambda^3 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \overline{v}, \quad m_\nu^{(l)} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \frac{v^2}{M_R}. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

They suggest the modified fermion mass hierarchies for the quark and the charged lepton sectors,

$$\begin{aligned} m_t : m_c : m_u &\simeq 1 : \lambda^4 : \lambda^6 \\ m_b : m_s : m_d &\simeq m_\tau : m_\mu : m_e \simeq 1 : \lambda^2 : \lambda^5 \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

with large $\tan\beta$. The hierarchical neutrino mass pattern is obtained when the rank of neutrino mass matrix is reduced as in the previous case.

As for the flavor mixings, the MNS matrix is the same as the previous case. However, the CKM matrix is modified as,

$$V_{CKM} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda & \lambda^3 \\ \lambda & 1 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^3 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{22}$$

matter multiplet	additional multiplets
$\mathbf{16}_1$	$\psi_{\mathbf{16}_{++}}, \psi_{\mathbf{16}_{+-}}, \psi_{\mathbf{16}_{-+}}, \psi_{\mathbf{16}_{--}}$
$\mathbf{16}_2$	$\psi_{\mathbf{16}_{+}}, \psi_{\mathbf{16}_{-}}$
$\mathbf{16}_3$	$\psi_{\mathbf{16}_{-}}$

Table 3: The matter fields in the Model II

The hierarchal structure of the above CKM matrix nicely reproduces the experimental data[26]. The Cabibbo angle has the suitable value with the relation of $\lambda \sim \sqrt{m_d/m_s}$. Therefore we can conclude that the second choice of radius, $R_{5,6}$ is more suitable for the fermion mass hierarchies and flavor mixings.

4 Model II

As the second model, we introduce extra matter multiplets in addition to the previous model[8]: $\psi_{\mathbf{16}_{-+}} + \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_{-+}} \equiv \psi'''_{\mathbf{16}_4} + \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_4'''}$ and $\psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_{--}} + \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_{--}} \equiv \psi''''_{\mathbf{16}_4} + \psi''''_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_4}$ (we call them the 4th generation fields) which propagate in the 6D bulk[∥] and interact with only the 1st generation matter multiplet, $\psi_{\mathbf{16}_{-}} + \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_{-}} \equiv \psi'_{\mathbf{16}_5} + \psi'_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_5}$ (we call them the 5th generation fields) which propagate in the 5D bulk ($x_6 = 0$) and interact with only the 2nd generation matter multiplet, $\psi_{\mathbf{16}_{-}} + \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_{-}} \equiv \psi_{\mathbf{16}_6} + \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_6}$ (we call them the 6th generation fields) which propagate in the 5D bulk ($x_6 = 0$) and interact with only the 3rd generation matter multiplet. All of them have 1 PQ charges.

In this case, the following terms are added to Eq.(3),

$$\begin{aligned} W_6 &= H_{16}H_{\overline{16}}\Bigg\{\frac{y'''_{44}}{M_*^3}\psi'''_{\mathbf{16}_4}\psi'''_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_4} + \frac{y''''_{44}}{M_*^3}\psi''''_{\mathbf{16}_4}\psi''''_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_4} + \frac{y'''_{14}}{M_*^2}\mathbf{16}_1\psi'''_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_4} + \frac{y''''_{14}}{M_*^2}\mathbf{16}_1\psi''''_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_4} \\ &+ \frac{y'_{55}}{M_*^2}\psi'_{\mathbf{16}_5}\psi'_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_5} + \frac{y'_{25}}{M_*^{3/2}}\mathbf{16}_2\psi'_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_5} + \frac{y_{66}}{M_*^2}\psi_{\mathbf{16}_6}\psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_6} + \frac{y_{36}}{M_*^{3/2}}\mathbf{16}_3\psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_6}\Bigg\}\delta(x_5)\delta(x_6), \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

which induce additional terms to Eq.(4) as,

$$\begin{aligned} W_4 &\simeq \frac{v_N^2}{M_*}\Bigg\{\epsilon_1^4\left(D_4^{'''(0)}\overline{D}_4^{'''(0)} + N_4^{'''(0)}\overline{N}_4^{'''(0)} + L_4^{''''(0)}\overline{L}_4^{''''(0)}\right) \\ &+ \epsilon_1^2\left(\overline{D}_1 D_4^{'''(0)} + \overline{N_1}N_4^{'''(0)} + L_1\overline{L_4}^{''''(0)}\right) \\ &+ \epsilon_2^2\left(D_5^{\prime(0)}\overline{D}_5^{\prime(0)} + N_5^{\prime(0)}\overline{N}_5^{\prime(0)} + L_5^{(0)}\overline{L}_5^{\prime(0)}\right) + \epsilon_2\left(\overline{D}_2 D_5^{\prime(0)} + \overline{N_2}N_5^{\prime(0)} + L_2\overline{L}_5^{\prime(0)}\right) \\ &+ \epsilon_2^2\left(D_6^{(0)}\overline{D}_6^{(0)} + N_6^{(0)}\overline{N}_6^{(0)} + L_6^{(0)}\overline{L}_6^{(0)}\right) + \epsilon_2\left(\overline{D}_3 D_6^{\prime(0)} + \overline{N_3}N_6^{(0)} + L_3\overline{L}_6^{(0)}\right)\Bigg\} \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

[∥] As commented in the previous discussion, four additional **10** matter fields must be introduced for the anomaly cancellation. However, we omit them since they have nothing to do with the fermion mass matrices due to the PQ-symmetry and their heavy masses.

After integrating out the vector-like heavy fields, the mass matrices of the light eigenstates in the up quark sector, the down quark sector, and the charged lepton sector are given as

$$m_u^l \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1^4 & \epsilon_2\epsilon_1^2 & \epsilon_1^2 \\ \epsilon_1^2\epsilon_2 & \epsilon_2^2 & \epsilon_2 \\ \epsilon_1^2 & \epsilon_2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} v, \;\; m_d^l \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1^4 & \epsilon_1^2\epsilon_2 & \epsilon_1^2\epsilon_2 \\ \epsilon_2\epsilon_1^2 & \epsilon_2^2 & \epsilon_2^2 \\ \epsilon_1^2 & \epsilon_2 & \epsilon_2 \end{pmatrix} \overline{v}, \;\; m_e^l \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1^4 & \epsilon_2\epsilon_1^2 & \epsilon_1^2 \\ \epsilon_1^2\epsilon_2 & \epsilon_2^2 & \epsilon_2 \\ \epsilon_1^2\epsilon_2 & \epsilon_2^2 & \epsilon_2 \end{pmatrix} \overline{v}, \tag{25}$$

respectively. As the mass matrices of the light eigenstates in the left-handed neutrino sector and the right-handed neutrino sector are given as

$$m_\nu^D \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1^4 & \epsilon_2\epsilon_1^2 & \epsilon_2\epsilon_1^2 \\ \epsilon_1^2\epsilon_2 & \epsilon_2^2 & \epsilon_2^2 \\ \epsilon_1^2\epsilon_2 & \epsilon_2^2 & \epsilon_2^2 \end{pmatrix} v, \;\; m_N \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1^4 & \epsilon_2\epsilon_1^2 & \epsilon_2\epsilon_1^2 \\ \epsilon_1^2\epsilon_2 & \epsilon_2^2 & \epsilon_2^2 \\ \epsilon_1^2\epsilon_2 & \epsilon_2^2 & \epsilon_2^2 \end{pmatrix} M_R, \tag{26}$$

respectively, the mass matrix of three light neutrinos $m_\nu^{(l)}$ through the see-saw mechanism is given by

$$m_\nu^{(l)} \simeq \frac{m_\nu^D m_\nu^{DT}}{m_N} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1^4 & \epsilon_2\epsilon_1^2 & \epsilon_2\epsilon_1^2 \\ \epsilon_1^2\epsilon_2 & \epsilon_2^2 & \epsilon_2^2 \\ \epsilon_1^2\epsilon_2 & \epsilon_2^2 & \epsilon_2^2 \end{pmatrix} \frac{v^2}{M_R}. \tag{27}$$

When we set $\epsilon_1 \sim \epsilon_2 \sim \lambda^2$, which corresponds to $1/R_5 = 1/R_6 = O(10^{16})$ GeV, we obtain the following fermion mass matrices [23]

$$\begin{aligned} m_u^l &\simeq \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^8 & \lambda^6 & \lambda^4 \\ \lambda^6 & \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} v, \;\; m_d^l \simeq \lambda^2 \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^6 & \lambda^4 & \lambda^4 \\ \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \overline{v}, \\ m_e^l &\simeq \lambda^2 \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^6 & \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 & 1 \\ \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \overline{v}, \;\; m_\nu^{(l)} \simeq \lambda^4 \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \frac{v^2}{M_R}. \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

The forms of these mass matrices are the same as those of the first case of Model I except for the overall factors. Thus the suitable fermion mass hierarchies of the quark and the charged lepton sectors are the same as Eq.(18). The flavor mixing matrices, V_{CKM} and V_{MNS}, are also the same as those of the first case of Model I. The different between this model and the first case of Model I exists just in the value of $\tan\beta$. This model shows the small $\tan\beta$ of $\tan\beta \sim \frac{m_t/m_b}{1/\lambda^2} \sim 1$. The discussion of neutrino mass hierarchy and the flavor mixings are also the same as the first case of Model I.

For another choice, when we set $\epsilon_1 \sim \lambda^{7/4}$ and $\epsilon_2 \sim \lambda^2$, which means $1/R_5 = O(10^{16})$ GeV and $1/R_6 = O(10^{17})$ GeV, we obtain the following fermion mass matrices.

$$m_u^l \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^7 & \lambda^{5\text{-}6} & \lambda^{3\text{-}4} \\ \lambda^{5\text{-}6} & \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^{3\text{-}4} & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} v, \;\; m_d^l \simeq \lambda^2 \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^5 & \lambda^{3\text{-}4} & \lambda^{3\text{-}4} \\ \lambda^{3\text{-}4} & \lambda^2 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^{1\text{-}2} & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \overline{v},$$

$$m_e^l \simeq \lambda^2 \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^5 & \lambda^{3\text{-}4} & \lambda^{1\text{-}2} \\ \lambda^{3\text{-}4} & \lambda^2 & 1 \\ \lambda^{3\text{-}4} & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \overline{v}, \ \ m_\nu^{(l)} \simeq \lambda^4 \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^3 & \lambda^{1\text{-}2} & \lambda^{1\text{-}2} \\ \lambda^{1\text{-}2} & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda^{1\text{-}2} & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \frac{v^2}{M_R}. \tag{29}$$

This case also shows the small $\tan\beta$. These mass matrices induce the fermion mass hierarchies of the quark and the charged lepton sectors as

$$\begin{aligned} m_t : m_c : m_u &\simeq 1 : \lambda^4 : \lambda^7 \ , \\ m_b : m_s : m_d &\simeq m_\tau : m_\mu : m_e \simeq 1 : \lambda^2 : \lambda^5 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

The flavor mixing matrices are given by

$$V_{CKM} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda^{1\text{-}2} & \lambda^{3\text{-}4} \\ \lambda^{1\text{-}2} & 1 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^{3\text{-}4} & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \ \ V_{MNS} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1/\sqrt{2} & 1/\sqrt{2} & \lambda^2 \\ 1/2 & -1/2 & 1/\sqrt{2} \\ -1/2 & 1/2 & 1/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{31}$$

Here we assume the reduction of rank in the neutrino mass matrix, $m_\nu^{(l)}$, for obtaining this MNS matrix.

5 Summary and Discussion

In this paper, we have shown three models based on the 6D $N = 1$ SUSY $SO(10)$ GUT where the 5th and 6th dimensional coordinates are compactified on a T^2/Z_2 orbifold. The gauge and Higgs fields live in 6 dimensions while ordinal chiral matter fields are localized in 4 dimensions. At first, we have shown briefly the model in Ref.[8] where in addition to the three-generation chiral matter fields, extra three sets of vector-like matter fields are introduced: $\psi_{\mathbf{16}_4} + \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_4}$, $\psi'_{\mathbf{16}_4} + \psi'_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_4}$ and four $\psi_{\mathbf{10}_\alpha}$s propagate in 6 dimensions and chiral fields which couple to $\psi_{\mathbf{16}_4} + \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_4}$, $\psi'_{\mathbf{16}_4} + \psi'_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_4}$ are defined as the 1st generation, and $\psi_{\mathbf{16}_5} + \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_5}$ propagate in 5 dimensions and chiral fields which couple to them are defined as the 2nd generation. This model shows the fermion mass hierarchies as, $m_t : m_c : m_u \simeq 1 : \lambda^4 : \lambda^8$, $m_b : m_s : m_d \simeq m_\tau : m_\mu : m_e \simeq 1 : \lambda^2 : \lambda^4$. and flavor mixings as,

$$V_{CKM} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^4 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \ \ V_{MNS} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We suggest two more models as the extensions of this model. The model I has additional $\psi_{\mathbf{16}_-} + \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_-}$ matter fields propagating in 5D space, $x_6 = 0$, which couple to the 1st generation chiral fields. When we set $\epsilon_1 \sim \epsilon_2 \sim \lambda^2$, which means $1/R_5 = 1/R_6 = O(10^{16})$ GeV, this model shows the mass hierarchies in the quark and the charged lepton sectors as, $m_t : m_c : m_u \simeq 1 : \lambda^4 : \lambda^8$, $m_b : m_s : m_d \simeq m_\tau : m_\mu : m_e \simeq 1 : \lambda^2 : \lambda^6$. When we assume that the rank is reduced in the neutrino mass matrix, the mass spectra of the neutrino mass eigenvalues becomes hierarchical, and the flavor mixings are given by

$$V_{CKM} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^4 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad V_{MNS} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1/\sqrt{2} & 1/\sqrt{2} & \lambda^2 \\ 1/2 & -1/2 & 1/\sqrt{2} \\ -1/2 & 1/2 & 1/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

For another choice of the sizes of compactification length of the extra dimensions as $\epsilon_1 \sim \lambda^{3/2}$ and $\epsilon_2 \sim \lambda^2$, which means $1/R_5 = O(10^{16})$ GeV and $1/R_6 = O(10^{17})$ GeV, this case shows the mass hierarchies of the quark and the charged lepton sectors as, $m_t : m_c : m_u \simeq 1 : \lambda^4 : \lambda^6$,$m_b : m_s : m_d \simeq m_\tau : m_\mu : m_e \simeq 1 : \lambda^2 : \lambda^5$. The case with the rank reduction of the neutrino mass matrix can give the hierarchical neutrino masses and the flavor mixings as,

$$V_{CKM} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda & \lambda^3 \\ \lambda & 1 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^3 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad V_{MNS} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1/\sqrt{2} & 1/\sqrt{2} & \lambda^2 \\ 1/2 & -1/2 & 1/\sqrt{2} \\ -1/2 & 1/2 & 1/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The too small (large) value of the Cabibbo angle (U_{e3}) can be avoided by power of λ.

The model II has additional $\psi_{\mathbf{16}_{++}} + \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_{++}}$ and $\psi_{\mathbf{16}_{+-}} + \psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_{+-}}$ which propagate in the 6D bulk and interact with only the 1st generation matter multiplets, and $\psi_{\mathbf{16}_{+}}$ ($\psi_{\overline{\mathbf{16}}_{+}}$), in 5D bulk ($x_6 = 0$) which interact with only the 2nd generation matter multiplets. When we set $\epsilon_1 \sim \epsilon_2 \sim \lambda^2$, which means $1/R_5 = 1/R_6 = O(10^{16})$ GeV, the fermion mass hierarchies and flavor mixings are the same as the first case of Model I. This case, however, suggests small $\tan\beta$ contrary to the first case of Model I. For another choice of $\epsilon_1 \sim \lambda^{7/4}$ and $\epsilon_2 \sim \lambda^2$, which means $1/R_5 = O(10^{16})$ GeV and $1/R_6 = O(10^{17})$ GeV, the fermion mass hierarchies are given by $m_t : m_c : m_u \simeq 1 : \lambda^4 : \lambda^7$, $m_b : m_s : m_d \simeq m_\tau : m_\mu : m_e \simeq 1 : \lambda^2 : \lambda^5$ with small $\tan\beta$. Assuming the rank reduction in the neutrino mass matrix, the flavor mixing matrices are given by

$$V_{CKM} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda^{1\text{-}2} & \lambda^{3\text{-}4} \\ \lambda^{1\text{-}2} & 1 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^{3\text{-}4} & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad V_{MNS} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1/\sqrt{2} & 1/\sqrt{2} & \lambda^2 \\ 1/2 & -1/2 & 1/\sqrt{2} \\ -1/2 & 1/2 & 1/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

This case can also avoid too small value of the Cabibbo angle.

Acknowledgment

We would like to thank M. Bando and N. Maekawa for useful discussions at the workshop “post NOON” in YITP on December 2001. This work is supported in part by the Grant-in-Aid for Science Research, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, of Japan (No.12740146, No.13001292).

References

[1] Y. Kawamura, Prog. Theor. Phys. **103** (2000), 613; ibid **105** (2001), 691; ibid **105** (2001), 999;
G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, Phys. Lett. B **511** (2001), 257;
A. B. Kobakhidze, Phys. Lett. B **514** (2001), 131;
L. J. Hall and Y. Nomura, Phys. Rev. D **64** (2001), 055003;
Y. Nomura, D. Smith and N. Weiner, Nucl. Phys. B **613** (2001), 147;
A. Hebecker and J. March-Russell, Nucl. Phys. B **613** (2001), 3;
R. Barbieri, L. J. Hall and Y. Nomura, hep-ph/0106190;
R. Barbieri, L. J. Hall and Y. Nomura, Nucl. Phys. B **624** (2002), 63;
L. J. Hall, H. Murayama and Y. Nomura, hep-th/0107245;
N. Haba, T. Kondo, Y. Shimizu, T. Suzuki and K. Ukai, Prog. Theor. Phys. **106** (2001), 1247;
Y. Nomura, hep-ph/0108170;
L. J. Hall and Y. Nomura, hep-ph/0111068.

[2] A. Hebecker and J. March-Russell, hep-ph/0107039.

[3] N. Haba, Y. Shimizu, T. Suzuki and K. Ukai, hep-ph/0107190.

[4] R. Dermisek and A. Mafi, Phys. Rev. D **65** (2002), 055002.

[5] T. Li, hep-ph/0108120; Phys. Lett. B **520** (2001), 377;
L. J. Hall, Y. Nomura and D. Smith, hep-ph/0107331;
T. Watari and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **519** (2001), 164.

[6] T. Asaka, W. Buchmüller and L. Covi, hep-ph/0108021.

[7] L. J. Hall, Y. Nomura, T. Okui and D. Smith, Phys. Rev. D **65** (2002), 035008.

[8] N. Haba, T. Kondo and Y. Shimizu, hep-ph/0112132.

[9] L. J. Hall, J. March-Russell, T. Okui and D. Smith, hep-ph/0108161.

[10] N. Arkani-Hamed, T. Gregoire and J. Wacker, hep-th/0101233.

[11] T. Kawamoto and Y. Kawamura, hep-ph/0106163.

[12] J. Scherk and J. H. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. B **82** (1979), 60; Nucl. phys. B **153** (1979), 61.

[13] A. Sagnotti, Phys. Lett. B **294** (1992), 196.

[14] H. Georgi and S. L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. Lett. **32**, (1974), 438.

[15] S. M. Barr, Phys. Lett. B **112** (1982), 219; Phys. Rev. D **40** (1989), 2457;
J. P. Derendinger, J. E. Kim and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B **139** (1984), 170;
I. Antoniadis, J. Ellis, J. S. Hagelin and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B **194** (1987), 231;
J. L. Lopez and D. V. Nanopoulos, hep-ph/9511266.

[16] M. B. Green and J. H. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. B **149** (1984), 117.

[17] T. Yanagida, in *Proceedings of the Workshop on Unified Theory and Baryon Number of the Universe*, eds. O. Sawada and A. Sugamoto (KEK, 1979) p.95; M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, in *Supergravity*, eds. P. van Nieuwenhuizen and D.Z. Freedman (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1979) p.315.

[18] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10** (1963) 531; M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49** (1973), 652.

[19] Z. Maki, M. Nakagawa and S. Sakata, Prog. Theor. Phys. **28** (1962), 870.

[20] K. S. Babu and S. M. Barr, Phys. Lett. B **381** (1996), 202;
S. M. Barr, Phys. Rev. D **55** (1997), 1659.

[21] M. J. Strassler, Phys. Lett. B **376** (1996), 119;
N. Haba, Phys. Rev. D **59** (1999), 035011;
K. Yoshioka, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **15** (2000), 29;
J. Hisano, K. Kurosawa, and Y. Nomura, Nucl. Phys. B **584** (2000), 3;
T. Blazek and S.F. King, Phys. Lett. B **518** (2001), 109.

[22] N. Haba and H. Murayama, Phys. Rev. D **63** (2001), 053010.

[23] J. Sato and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **493** (2000), 356; J. Sato and K. Tobe, Phys. Rev. D **63** (2001), 116010.

[24] F. Vissani, JHEP 9811 (1998), 025.

[25] M. Tanimoto, Phys. Lett. B **501** (2001), 231.

[26] D. E. Groom *et al.* [Particle Data Group Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **15**,(2000) 1.